

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

**by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 17 January 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3158816**

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Flat, 153 Leighton Road, London NW5 2RB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Ashok Gohil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2016/2582/P, dated 27 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2016.
  - The development proposed is mansard roof to existing first and second floor flat.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a three storey flat roofed building located in a prominent position at the junction of Leighton Avenue and Toriano Avenue. The host building contains a shop at ground floor with a residential flat above. It adjoins a similarly proportioned building at 151 Leighton Avenue, with the front elevations of Nos 151 & 153 being set forward of the front elevations of a terrace of adjoining smaller scaled buildings on Leighton Avenue. Though there is some variation in the external appearance of Nos 151 & 153, they are the same scale and both contain a painted rendered band at eaves level which serves to emphasise the parapet walls at roof height. A large chimney is positioned centrally on the roof of Nos 151 & 153 and contributes to the character of the buildings.
  4. Though not listed or located within a Conservation Area the host building nevertheless makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area which contains a variety of building heights and designs. This includes examples of roof extensions, though the other corner buildings on the junction of Leighton Avenue and Toriano Avenue appear to have largely unaltered flat roofs.
  5. Whilst the mansard roof extension would be set in slightly from the edge of the roof and would retain the original cornice and parapet, it would nevertheless extend across the majority of the existing roof. Notwithstanding the use of
-

traditional materials its height and particular design, which contains four dormers, means that the roof extension would be an incongruous addition which would substantially alter and be harmful to the character and appearance of the flat roofed host building and would result in a harmful loss of symmetry in the scale and appearance of the host building and No 151.

6. The roof extension would be positioned close to and would partially obscure the existing large central chimney and despite its set back and height would be visible when viewed from various vantage points on Leighton Avenue and Toriano Avenue. Though it appears that the proposal would mean that the height of the host building would be similar to the height of the building on the opposite side of Toriano Avenue, this does not justify the proposal or overcome the harm identified.
7. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the fact that there are examples of roof extensions within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site and at my site visit I viewed the other sites referred to by the appellant from the road. Whilst I acknowledge that these roof extensions form part of the character of the area, none appear to be directly comparable to the proposal being less prominently located and of a differing design and scale. I therefore give them limited weight. In any event, I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits. Whilst the Council's Planning Guidance on Design (CPG1) states that mansard roof extensions may be acceptable where it is the established roof form, I do not consider that to be the case with the appeal site. Finally whilst I have some sympathy with the appellant's need for additional accommodation, this benefit of the proposal does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to the development plan and in particular Policy CS5 of the Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policy DP24 of the Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies. These policies seek, amongst other things, development that protects and enhances the environment and is of the highest standard of design. The proposal is also contrary to relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek to secure high quality design.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I hereby conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Beverley Wilders*

INSPECTOR